

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010087US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10087

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated June 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 13, 2005. Applicant submits this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-21, 23-31 and 33-34 are pending in the application. Claims 6 and 23 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-21, 24-31 and 33-34 remain pending following entry of this response. ~~Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-21, 23-31 and 33-34 are pending in the application.~~ Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include limitations of now canceled claims 6 and 23, respectively. Applicant submits that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-21, 23-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang et al.* (U.S. 6,708,223, hereinafter *Wang*).

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion.

For example, regarding independent claims 1, 11, and 18, *Wang* fails to teach manipulating a pure value buffer in the manners recited. Specifically, *Wang* fails to teach eliminating remote (or second) node write only-type data from the pure value buffer, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 18, or removing local node read only-type data from the pure value buffer, as recited in claim 28.

On page 4 of the Office Action (sections 9 and 10), the Examiner refers to col. 11, lines 31-42 of *Wang* as teaching eliminating remote node write only-type data and

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010087US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10087

local node read only-type data from a pure value buffer, prior to transmitting the pure value buffer to a remote node. The cited portions are included herein for convenient reference.

As can be seen, the present invention reduces the number of copies on the client side when calling an interface by marshaling only a list of pointers into the RPC buffer 123 and allowing the network to access the data directly. On the server side, the received data can be retained in the RPC buffer 141, without copying to memory 147. Additionally, such lists of pointers can be used to eliminate a copy on the server side when sending a response from the DCOM server 142, and when receiving the response on the client side. The elimination of these copies results in a more efficient transfer process from the DCOM client 120 to the DCOM server 142 and from the server to the client.

Applicant respectfully submit, however, that the recited portions do not teach eliminating remote node write only-type data or local node read only-type data, as claimed.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 11, and 18, as well as those claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010087US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10087

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant